Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figures 3, 4, and 5. In Figures 3, 4, and 5, "5V_SW" has been changed to "5V". Additionally, In Figure 3, "$\underline{V}_{SW}$" has been changed to "V_{SW}". Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 6, lines 29 – 33 and page 7 lines 1-2.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed March 17, 2008, claims 1 and 4-9 were rejected. Additionally, the specification and the drawings were objected to. In response, Applicant has amended the specification, the drawings, and claims 1 and 7. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action suggests that the term "analogue" should be replaced by the term "analog". In response, the specification has been amended throughout to replace the term "analogue" with the term "analog" as suggested.

The Office Action also suggests adding subheadings to the specification. As such headings are not required and have in the past been known to affect the scope of protection afforded, Applicant respectfully declines.

The Office Action also suggests that the reference labels in Figure 2 (I^2C) and Figure 4 (48, 50, 52, PESW) need corresponding descriptions. In response, the corresponding description of Figure 2 (I2C) and Figure 4 (48, 50, 52, PESW) can be found in the specification, for example, at page 5 lines 12 to lines 22, and at page 5 lines 30 to 34 and page 5 lines 21 to 22 respectively.

The Office Action also suggests that the specification needs to provide a corresponding description stating that the "second switch" is "an integrated circuit'. In response, the description stating that the "second switch" is "an integrated circuit' can be found, for example, at page 2 lines 27 to lines 29 of the original specification.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action states that "5V_SW" in Figures 3 and 5 and "$\underline{V}_{SW}$" in Figure 3 should be changed for appropriate characterizations. In response, "5V_SW" has been changed to "5V" in Figures 3, 4, and 5. Additionally, in Figure 3, "$\underline{V}_{SW}$" has been changed to "V_{SW}". Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 6, lines 29 – 33 and page 7 lines 1-2 of the original specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 8 are objected for inappropriate characterizations. In regard to the objection to claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested. In regard to the objection to claim 8, Applicant respectfully asserts that I2C is an acceptable name variant of NXP's I^2C bus.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 7, and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 7 is rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Claims 1 and 4-9 are rejected as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In regard to the rejection to claim 7, Applicant has amended claim 7 to include structural cooperative relationships of elements, which particularly point out that "the first driver circuit and the second driver circuit are operably connected to the control terminal." Support for the amendment, is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, Figure 5 and page 7 lines 9 to lines 14. In regard to the rejections of claims 1 and 4-9, Applicant respectfully asserts that the high and low "insertion loss" between the common port and the corresponding branch port applies to "each" switch state. Support can be found, in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 6 lines 8 to lines 22.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heckaman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,272,457, hereinafter Heckaman) in view of Even-or (U.S. Pat. No. 5,212,408, hereinafter Even-or.) Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heckaman in view of Even-or and further in view of Atokawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,970,056, hereinafter Atokawa.) However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Heckaman, Even-or and Atokawa for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites in part "wherein said first switches are each implemented using two anti-parallel PIN-diodes in series connection between first and second ports, and a driver terminal is connected between the diodes" (emphasis added). In contrast to claim 1, Heckaman discloses that the first switches are implemented by transistors and not by series connected PIN diodes (Figure 6). Even-or does disclose a diode switch configuration having two series connected diodes. Even-or also discloses that driver circuits (12, 14, 18, 20, 22) connect the ends of these two series connected diodes. However, Even-or does not discloses that a driver terminal is connected between the diodes, see Figure 1A of Even-or. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Heckaman and Even-or because the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims 4-9

Claims 4-9 are dependent on claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4-9 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 17, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111